

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 310924  
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 PM-05 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INR-07  
NSAE-00 /025 R

DRAFTED BY OSD/ISA:JTYLER:MEM  
APPROVED BY EUR/RPM:SJLEDOGAR  
OASD/PA AND E:RSCHNEIDER  
JS/J-5:COL. PARRISH (INFORMED)  
OSD:RKOMER  
EUR/RPM:WTROBINSON/JAFROEBE,JR.  
PM/ISP:JYOCHELSON

-----045625 310059Z /66

O P 310005Z DEC 77  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
TO USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE  
INFO USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY  
USCINCEUR PRIORITY  
USLO SACLANT PRIORITY  
CINCLANT PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 310924

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MPOL, NATO

SUBJECT:LONG-TERM DEFENSE PROGRAM - ITERATION OF  
DISCUSSION ON CATEGORIZATION

REF: USNATO 13090, DTG 271813Z DEC 77

1. WHILE WE FEEL IT ESSENTIAL AT SOME POINT TO CATEGORIZE  
TF PROPOSALS, WE AGREE WITH MISSION ON UNDESIRABILITY OF  
ASKING TASK FORCES TO DO SO AT THIS STAGE, IN PARTICULAR  
LEST CATEGORY B BECOME A REFUGE FOR EVERYTHING WHICH  
CANNOT EASILY BE AGREED. WE DID NOT MEAN TO IMPLY THAT  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 310924

CATEGORY A SHOULD BE CONFINED TO THOSE MATTERS ON WHICH  
NATIONS' AGREEMENT COULD READILY BE REACHED. ON THE  
CONTRARY, CATEGORY A WAS MEANT TO INSURE PRIMARY FOCUS ON  
OUR KEY PROGRAM EMPHASES (MAIN ACTION AREAS), WHICH WE  
WORKED SO HARD TO GET INTO DPC GUIDANCE. ONLY IF ONE OR  
MORE OF THESE MAIN ACTION AREAS SIMPLY COULD NOT BE  
WHIPPED INTO SUFFICIENTLY PROGRAMMATIC SHAPE BY THE TIME

EWG ITSELF GOT THROUGH WITH IT WOULD WE ENVISAGE A CATEGORY A ITEM SLIPPING TO CATEGORY B. THIS SEEMS TO BE IN FULL ACCORD WITH YOUR VIEWS.

2. CATEGORY B WOULD BE INTENDED PRIMARILY AS A CATCHALL FOR THOSE MANY PROPOSALS WHICH MOST TFS HAVE IN MIND WHICH

DO NOT FIT IN EITHER CATEGORY A OR CATEGORY C BUT WHICH HAVE MERIT. WE SEE THIS CATEGORY AS A WAY TO SEGREGATE A LOT OF USEFUL BUSINESS WHICH NEVERTHELESS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO GET IN THE WAY OF DEFMIN FOCUS ON KEY PROGRAM AREAS. WHILE CATEGORY B MIGHT LATER ALSO BE USED AS A REPOSITORY FOR THOSE CATEGORY A ITEMS WHICH WERE SIMPLY NOT YET IN SHAPE FOR MINISTERIAL ACTION, WE AGREE THAT IT WOULD BE PREMATURE TO SAY SO NOW.

3. CATEGORY C IS INTENDED AS A MEANS OF HIGHLIGHTING AS WELL AS SEGREGATING POLICY, PROCEDURAL, AND ORGANIZATIONAL PROPOSALS, IN KEEPING WITH OUR INSISTENCE LTDP ALSO FOCUS ON BETTER IMPLEMENTATION MACHINERY.

4. BUT WE AGREE WITH MISSION THAT IT IS PREMATURE TO LOCK TFS INTO A CATEGORIZATION CONCEPT BEFORE WE OURSELVES HAVE SORTED IT OUT, EVEN THOUGH WE BOTH AGREE SOME CATEGORIZATION WILL PROBABLY BE NECESSARY EVENTUALLY.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 310924

5. INDEED, OUR UNDERLYING AIM IS TO DEVISE A STRATEGY FROM HERE ON OUT WHICH WILL FORESTALL LTDP PROGRAMS' BEING REDUCED TO LOWEST COMMON DENOMINATOR OF NATIONAL AGREEMENT, ESPECIALLY AS INTERPRETED BY LOWER-LEVEL NATIONAL STAFFS BEFORE THE ISSUES EVER GET TO MINISTERS FOR REVIEW. IF PRIOR NATIONAL AGREEMENT TO TF PROPOSALS BECOMES A SINE QUA NON, WE WILL END UP WITH AN LTDP NOT WORTH THE CANDLE. HENCE, WE HAVE THREE CONCERNS ON CONTENT AND HANDLING OF TASK FORCE REPORTS:

A. TASK FORCES SHOULD NOT BE SO CONSTRAINED BY THE CONCEPTS OF QUOTE DOABLE, UNQUOTE QUOTE ACCEPTABLE, UNQUOTE QUOTE FEASIBLE, UNQUOTE PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THEY RECOMMEND ACTION ONLY AT THE LEVEL OF THE LOWEST COMMON DENOMINATOR. WHILE THEY ARE TO FRAME THEIR PROPOSALS AGAINST A REALISTIC BACKGROUND, NEVERTHELESS THEY ARE TO RECOMMEND ACTIONS WHICH WOULD OFFER SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT IN NATO DEFENSE IN THE MID OR LONG-TERM. THIS IS ESPECIALLY APPLICABLE IN RECOMMENDING COMMON OR COLLECTIVE EFFORTS IN NEW FIELDS OF DEFENSE COOPERATION, WHERE NATIONAL HABITS MAY STAND AS AN OBSTACLE; NATIONAL OPPOSITION OF THIS TYPE SHOULD NOT

BAR THE TASK FORCE FROM SUBMITTING APPROPRIATE RECOMMENDATIONS. THIS IS APPLICABLE ALSO IN CASES OF PROGRAM PROPOSALS WHICH CALL FOR SPECIFIED NATIONAL ACTIONS. IF THE TASK FORCE DIRECTOR IS CONVINCED OF THE IMPORTANCE OF HIS PROPOSALS, HE SHOULD NOT BE DETERRED BY NATIONAL OPPOSITION FROM SUBMITTING RECOMMENDATIONS. WE WILL ASSIST LATER AS NECESSARY IN EWG, PERMREPS, AND DPC TO OVERCOME THAT OPPOSITION.

B. WE THINK THAT TASK FORCES SHOULD IDENTIFY CLEARLY THOSE PROGRAM AREAS OF IMPORTANCE ON WHICH THEY HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO COMPLETE WORK BUT WHICH WARRANT COMPLETION TO PERMIT CONSIDERATION FOR LATER INCLUSION IN THE PROGRAM. SIMILARLY, THEY SHOULD ALSO IDENTIFY THOSE

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 310924

COMPLETED AREAS OF IMPORTANCE WHOSE PRIORITY DOES NOT REQUIRE IMMEDIATE INCORPORATION IN THE PROGRAM BUT WHICH SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR INCORPORATION IN A LATER PHASE.

C. FINAL DRAFT REPORT EMERGING FROM EWG SHOULD CONVEY OPPORTUNITY FOR SIGNIFICANT MOVEMENT IN NATO DEFENSE EITHER AS AN AGREED RESULT OF QUOTE COLLECTIVE JAWBONING UNQUOTE OR INrecognition THAT DECISIONS TO ACCEPT LESS SHOULD OCCUR ONLY AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL.

6. CONSEQUENTLY, WE PREFER NOT TO CALL FOR TASK FORCES TO RECORD NATIONAL DEMURRERS TO THEIR PROPOSALS AS SUGGESTED IN PARA 3 FOR ITS PROPOSALS.

7. ON SUBSTANCE OF NATIONAL QUOTE COMMITMENT, UNQUOTE WHICH IN OUR VIEW SHOULD COVER IMPLEMENTING ACTION IN NATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SUPPORT IN PRINCIPLE FOR APPROPRIATE ACTIONS IN NATO COMMITTEES, WE WOULD APPRECIATE MORE DETAILED MISSION VIEWS OF THE VARIOUS SIZES OF QUOTE SAUSAGE SKINS UNQUOTE OF COMMITMENT. IN OUR VIEW A PROGRAM IS A PROGRAM IS A PROGRAM.

8. REGARDING PARA 4B REFTEL, WE ARE NOT YET IN POSITION TO FURNISH FINAL VIEWS.

CHRISTOPHER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN



## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** MILITARY PLANS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 31-Dec-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977STATE310924  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** JTYLER:MEM  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D780003-0800  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t1977121/aaaaaaka.tel  
**Line Count:** 162  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 26df20fb-c188-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ORIGIN EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 78 USNATO 13090  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 30-Aug-2004 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 100850  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** LONG-TERM DEFENSE PROGRAM - ITERATION OF DISCUSSION ON CATEGORIZATION  
**TAGS:** MPOL, NATO  
**To:** USNATO  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkvgwkey:** odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/26df20fb-c188-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009